

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in-person interview held on March 20, 2008. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 14, 16-24, 27 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani et al ("Use SOAP-based intermediaries to build chains of Web service functionality", Mani, Anbazhagan and Nargarajan, Arun, September 2, 2002, <<http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/webservices/library/ws-soapbase/>>), hereafter *Mani*, in view of Graham et al ("Building Web Services with Java: SOAP", Graham, Steve; Boubez, Toufic; Daniels, Glen; Davis, Doug; Nakamura, Yuichi; Neyama, Ryo; and Simeonov, Simeon. May 10, 2002, <<http://www.informit.com/articles/article.aspx?p=26666&seqNum=8>>), hereinafter *Graham*. Claims 12-13, 15, 25-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mani* in view of *Graham*, and further in view of "what was well [known] in the art at the time of the invention."¹

By this amendment claims 1, 18, 32 and 34 have been amended and new claims 35-38 have been added.² Claims 28-31 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-28 and 32-38 are pending, of which claims 1, 18, 32 and 34 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to dispatching a received message without having direct access to information relevant for the dispatch. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a message at the receiving computing system and passing the received message through one or more receiving path components that are positioned in the receiving path of the message prior to being passed to the dispatching component. The passing of the received message to the dispatching component occurs within the receiving computing system, and each of the receiving path components in the receiving path are components of the receiving computing system. Next, claim 1 defines at least one of the one or more receiving path

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims and the new claims is found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0007], [0028]-[0030] and Figures 2 & 3.

components modifying the message with at least one modification. The modification includes information that is not included in the received message. The information is used by the dispatching mechanism to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods. The methods are configured to process the content of the message according to the type of information included in the message.

Claim 1 further defines dispatching mechanism receiving the modified message from the receiving path within the receiving computing system. Lastly, claim 1 defines, based on the information obtained in the modification, the dispatching mechanism using the obtained information to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, the dispatching comprising transferring the modified received message to the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further specialized message content processing based on the type of information included in the modification.

Claim 18 is a computer program product claim similar to claim 1. Claim 32 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes functional language. Claim 34 is a system claim generally corresponding to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

As discussed during the interview, *Mani* describes a system for passing a SOAP message from a client to a service provider through a series of intermediary servers (see Fig. 2). Each intermediary can add/delete/modify fields in the SOAP message header and thereby change attributes of the message. For example, intermediaries can change the messages intended path by adding new intermediaries to the routing path (p. 2, par. 7). Each intermediary represents a separate computing system. Thus, as Figure 2 illustrates, the SOAP message path begins at a service client computing system, goes through intermediary computing systems A & B, and ends at the destination computing system, the service provider. *Mani* is silent as to what type of processing happens after the message reaches its destination. *Mani* is further silent on adding

information to the message that is used to determine which method will process the message upon delivery to its destination. Moreover, *Mani* is silent regarding selecting an appropriate method from a group of methods based on the type of information included in the modified message.

Graham is cited primarily to describe a system that includes multiple intermediaries on a single computer system. *Graham* teaches that SOAP intermediaries may themselves be applications (p. 21, paragraph 3, lines 1-2), and that multiple applications can be stored on the same server (p. 23, paragraphs 2&3). However, *Graham*, like *Mani*, is silent as to what type of processing happens after the message reaches its destination. *Graham* is further silent on adding information to the message that is used to determine which method will process the message upon delivery to its destination. Moreover, *Graham* is silent regarding selecting an appropriate method from a group of methods based on the type of information included in the modified message.

Thus, as discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests at least one of the one or more receiving path components modifying the message with at least one modification, the modification including information that is not included in the received message, the information being used by the dispatching mechanism to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods, the methods being configured to process the content of the message according to the type of information included in the message, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests, based on the information obtained in the modification, an act of the dispatching mechanism using the obtained information to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, the dispatching comprising transferring the modified received message to the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further specialized message content processing based on the type of information included in the modification, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 18, 32 and 34 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 18, 32 and 34,

each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Although each of the dependent claims patentably define over the prior art of record for the same reasons as their corresponding base claims, many of the dependent claims also independently distinguish over the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest selecting an appropriate method from the group of methods, wherein the selection is based on the type of information included in the modification, as recited in claim 35.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 4th day of April, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:GRL:ger